

REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed February 3, 2009 and having a period for response set to expire on May 3, 2009. An After Final Amendment was filed on April 3, 2009 within two months of mailing date of the final Office Action, such that the period for response expires on the mailing date of the Advisory Action or the date set forth in the final Office Action, whichever is later. The Advisory Action was mailed on July 15, 2009, thus the period for response expired on July 15, 2009 and a Petition for a 1-month extension of time, together with the requisite fee for same, is submitted herewith, thereby extending the period for response to August 3, 2009.

Claims 1-20 and 22 had been pending in the application.

Claims 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 20 and 22 have been cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman et al. (6,772,150).

The claims are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments in the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet, and thus the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

Applicants request an interview with the Examiner to expedite prosecution.

The Advisory Action Continuation Sheet generally maintains the same grounds of rejection as in the final Office Action. In addition, the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet asserts the following phrase is not recited in the claims: 'second display form is designated independently from selected said display item on the transformed information in the first display form.' In particular, the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet alleges Whitman's FIG. 8, 'Related Searches' 810 or 'Top Matches for this search,' can be interpreted to correspond to the claimed "second display form" in relation to search results. In other words, according to the Examiner, FIG. 8 displays the search results for the phrase 'DOG' in three display forms of (1) 'Related Searches' 810 (2) 'Top Matches for this search,' and (3) 'Full Results' 820. In addition, the Examiner appears to suggest that selecting a hyperlink on Whitman's FIG. 8 refers to selection of the item and the designation of the display item. However, in Whitman when the user selects

the 'Related Search' item 810, such as 'Walkin the Dog,' the subsequent search result would be displayed in the same display forms of 'Related Searches' 810, 'Top Matches for this search,' and 'Full Results' 820.

Claim 1 is amended to require "**receiving from said user designation of a second display form different from said first display form**~~from said user~~; ... and **second transforming said extracted data of said documents corresponding to said selected generated display item as extracted selected data into information to indicate said extracted selected data of said documents to said user in said second user designated display form**, which is designated by said user and different from said first display form, specified by said user and to **enable said user to select a display item from said extracted selected data to be utilized as a third search condition** in a follow up search process following processing, wherein said display item is generated from said data of said documents corresponding to said selected display item, and **outputting the second transformed information in the second user designated display form**." For example, FIGS. 8 and page 13, lines 3-8; and FIGS. 9-13 and page 14, line 2 to page 16, line 6, of the specification support the claims. In addition, FIGS. 14 and 15 are two examples of the claimed "second display form" in relation to the first display form of patent map in FIG. 7.

A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Whitman cannot be established, because there is no evidence that Whitman's FIG. 8 discussions disclose, either expressly or inherently by necessarily requiring, the language of amended claim 1 "**second transforming said extracted data of said documents corresponding to said selected generated display item as extracted selected data into information to indicate said extracted selected data of said documents to said user in said second user designated display form** ... and **outputting the second transformed information in the second user designated display form**" in combination with "**enable said user to select a display item from said extracted selected data to be utilized as a third search condition** in a follow up search process." Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 16 and 18 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed amended limitations of claim 1.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims. For example, the language of claim 2 provides one or more examples of first and second display forms.

Accordingly, dependent claim 2 is allowable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: August 3, 2009 By: Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501